

SFCA-0287  
Doc. 1 of 2  
91 00622

# REPORT OF THE SUPERVISORS' INTERDEPARTMENTAL TASK FORCE ON MUNI TRANSFER SALES



September 18, 1990  
By Jerry P. Coleman,  
Assistant District Attorney

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
NOV - 5 1990  
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

## For the Task Force:

Kathy Gilbert, Muni

Jerry Coleman, SFDA

Harold Guetersloh, PUC

Lt. Ed Geeter, SFPD

Sue Stropes, Muni

Stanton Jones, Budget Analyst

Theresa Serrata & Larry Florin, Mayor's Office

PRESENTED TO THE SUPERVISORS' CITY SERVICES COMMITTEE:

Hon. Angela Alioto, Chair; Hon. Richard Hongisto; Hon. Wendy Nelder





REPORT OF THE SUPERVISORS' MUNI TRANSFER SALES  
INTERDEPARTMENTAL TASK FORCE

September 18, 1990

Task Force Members:

Kathy Gilbert, General Superintendent, Muni Surface Transport  
Jerry P. Coleman, Assistant DA in Charge of Misdem. Trial Div.  
Stanton Jones, Supervisors' Budget Analyst  
Harold Guetersloh, PUC Finance  
Lt. Ed Geeter, SFPD Muni Transit Chief  
Theresa Serrata and Larry Florin, Mayor's Office  
Sue Stropes, Muni Service Planning

Introduction:

On July 17, 1990, the Supervisors' City Services Committee held a public hearing at the request of Supervisor Gonzalez concerning the problems caused by the theft and sale of Muni transfers on certain San Francisco street corners. Of primary concern was the reported loss total of \$1 million in Muni revenues; secondarily was the concern of citizens living or working in the affected areas of street sales that they be free from this recurrent and annoying form of street crime. Testimony was taken from Muni, SFPD, the District Attorney's Office, as well as concerned citizens.

The Committee voted to form an interdepartmental task force to study the problem and ways to combat it. By resolution amended July 23, 1990 (no. 579-90), the Committee charged this task force to prepare a report to the Board "consisting on [sic] the advisability and feasibility of eliminating the use of Muni transfers permanently and reducing Muni fares to a level that would allow only per trip fares." The Committee also directed the Budget Analyst to survey other large city transit systems to determine their transit policies. The Committee ordered task force findings and recommendations by September 18, 1990.

Task Force Progress

The interdepartmental task force met three times, on August 20, September 7, and September 14. The various aspects of the problem were spiritedly discussed in detail,

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE  
FOR THE YEAR 1894

Presented to the Senate and House of Representatives  
at their respective sessions in 1895

THE LAND OFFICE

The Land Office, under the direction of the Commissioner, has during the year 1894, been engaged in the following work:—  
1. To receive and process applications for land.  
2. To issue patents for land.  
3. To receive and process applications for mineral rights.  
4. To issue patents for mineral rights.  
5. To receive and process applications for water rights.  
6. To issue patents for water rights.  
7. To receive and process applications for other rights.  
8. To issue patents for other rights.

THE LAND OFFICE

On July 17, 1894, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, issued a circular letter to the several land offices, directing them to prepare and submit to him, for his consideration, a report of the work done during the year 1894. The circular letter was received by the several land offices on July 20, 1894, and they have since that time been engaged in preparing their reports. The reports have been received by the Commissioner on the following dates:—  
Alaska Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
California Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Colorado Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Idaho Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Montana Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Nebraska Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
New Mexico Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
North Dakota Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Oregon Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
South Dakota Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Texas Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Utah Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Washington Land Office, August 1, 1894.  
Wyoming Land Office, August 1, 1894.

THE LAND OFFICE

The Commissioner of the General Land Office, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, has during the year 1894, been engaged in the following work:—  
1. To receive and process applications for land.  
2. To issue patents for land.  
3. To receive and process applications for mineral rights.  
4. To issue patents for mineral rights.  
5. To receive and process applications for water rights.  
6. To issue patents for water rights.  
7. To receive and process applications for other rights.  
8. To issue patents for other rights.



and informal working groups devised to tackle parts of the problem within their joint expertise. PUC and Muni concentrated their efforts in a detailed examination of the pathway for transfers - from printer all the way to PUC return of unused books; their emphasis in this examination was any point along the path wherein controls were lax. PUC also reported on the state of fare box technology, in light of a major planned Muni purchase of new fareboxes (currently out to bid). Muni, with SFDA input, began to develop a campaign of public education, through bus signs, warning of the criminal consequences of theft/sale of transfers. PUC, SFPD and SFDA cooperated during this time in the street purchase of numerous transfers, and the reporting back of those transfer numbers; in this way, it was hoped that the original source of the stolen transfers - if within Muni personnel - could be traced. Meanwhile, the Budget Analyst formulated its survey questions and conducted its preliminary survey of other transit systems, reporting its initial results back to the task force for fine tuning and analysis.

#### Task Force Findings:

##### *1. Extent of Losses*

The task force discovered that the reported extent of loss - \$1 million/year - was based on police extrapolations of arrest figures; e.g., number of suspects arrested with stolen transfer books in a short time frame multiplied by the number of stolen transfers multiplied by \$.85 per transfer. The task force found such figures to be rough estimates at best, and based on assumptions of criminal activity continuing at the same pace as during the time frame studied. The task force concluded that alternative methods of determining the loss total be studied. For example, PUC is currently able to determine both the amount of transfers delivered to Muni and the amount returned unused, for given time periods; the subtraction of the latter figure from the former would yield the total transfer usage (both legal and illegal). A ridership survey could then provide statistically significant data on legal transfer use, leaving a remainder figure (illegal use, or lost/discarded/unaccounted for transfers) as a better value against which to check the police extrapolations. The task force found that determining a more accurate loss figure is a primary need, as choosing among potential solutions to the problem (based on cost and other considerations) may well hinge on the true extent of the problem.





## *2. Muni Transfer Path*

Muni determined two main and one minor area of weakness along the transfer path. First are distributions of transfers later than the initial distribution to the first operators in the day; unless each operator is required to sign for transfers received (from supervisors, if needed later in a run as the original allotment is expended, or from the previous shift's driver), the transfer tracking system begins to break down later in the day. In other words, if a stolen transfer is purchased early in the day, its number can be traced from PUC to Muni barn to initial run distribution, which run would most likely be the source of the loss; but if the purchase occurs later in the day, the tracing stops at the initial run distribution, and any potential sources of the loss later in the day are impossible to track without driver signing for all transfers. The task force found that driver signing for all transfers could provide better tracking, and could be made Muni/PUC policy, but could potentially introduce significant time and paperwork costs into the system.

The second main area of potential loss identified was certain storage containers at certain barns, intended for unused transfers at the end of runs. Although some containers were unsupervised and relatively unsecure (of temporary materials), Muni policy already begun in mid-summer hastened the application of locked, permanent transfer receptacles and better supervision. See Muni Bulletin no. 90-069 (14 July 1990) and included 5 page policy memo, attached at the end of the task force report.

A final area was studied for loss potential, that being loss from Muni vehicles during operator breaks or when the operator is outside the vehicle to replace the overhead lines. The task force found that better security measures during driver absences (placing all transfers in the vehicle's lock box, per the above-noted Bulletin), and close coordination between Muni and SFPD Muni transit detail in the reporting and investigation of losses, could significantly diminish this relatively small area of loss. Alternatively in this area, are losses due to lock box keys in the wrong hands (e.g., ex-Muni drivers).

## *3. Fare Box Technology*

The task force reviewed PUC recommendations concerning its current bid for new fare boxes. It was found that technology for fare boxes to electronically print transfers (without need for driver handling) was either non-existent or highly impractical; tests of such technology have consistently failed, due to jiggling of the boxes on city





streets and/or printing too small to be efficiently read by drivers. The PUC bid, then, will remain as it has been currently let out, for boxes which are improved but which do not impact the transfer loss problem.

#### *4. Muni Vehicle Signage*

The task force found that an effective public education campaign, directed at both potential sellers and potential buyers of stolen transfers, was a simple and cost-effective way to alert potential transfer abusers of the risks of their enterprise and the seriousness with which the system is taking their conduct. To that end, Muni has printed and begun distributions of warning signs to be posted in Muni vehicles, which are written in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Tagalog. A reduced-size version of the English sign is attached at the end of the task force report. Additional signs, slightly modified as a result of District Attorney input so as to alert potential transfer buyers of their criminal risks, will be posted later.

#### *5. Street Purchases of Stolen Transfers*

SFPD and SFDA began a program of street purchase of stolen transfers, early in the day, to look for patterns in potential sources of the transfers. Tracking was accomplished through the use of PUC personnel. While no particular driver for the period studied became the focus of the losses, a significant portion of the loss was identified and localized at the Woods' Owl runs (nearly 3 books recovered from only 10 issued to those runs). Concerned drivers were being questioned by Muni personnel, with their explanations being forwarded to SFPD.

Given that this cooperative investigative effort did yield a localized focus, the task force decided to continue the street purchase program, as well as other law enforcement surveillance efforts.

#### *6. Survey of Other Transit Systems*

The Budget Analyst member of the task force performed yeoman's service making contact with representatives of 12 metropolitan transit systems: AC Transit, Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Washington D.C., Detroit, New York City, New Orleans, Portland, and Seattle. A basic series of questions was asked, and limited answers obtained (see answer grid attached to the task force report); the limited time frame for the task force's work prevented more detailed discussions.

However, certain initial findings could be gleaned from this brief telephonic survey. Most cities surveyed had





little or no problems with transfer theft/sales. Those cities with the least expressed problem, or expressing confidence that they had whatever transfer loss problem under control, shared one common characteristic: a large transit police force. Even a city with admittedly weak control over transfer inventories (Seattle) expressed no problem with misuse. On the other end of the control spectrum was Chicago, with very tight transfer policies (including numbered, signed-for transfers and a form of punching utilized); Chicago likewise expressed little or no problem with abuse.

What appeared most surprising, then, to the task force, was that San Francisco, with its relatively strong controls, was nonetheless experiencing a significant problem in abuse. This factor prompted task force members to renew their call for a ridership survey which could help determine truly how significant this transfer abuse problem really is here.

The task force also found that some other cities charged an additional small fare for transfers. A suggestion that such practice be instituted here was immediately rejected by strong consensus, it being felt that setting a price for transfers would make the transfer a more valuable commodity and thus increase illegal sales.

In discussions comparing these transit systems, our own Muni planning member of the task force made clear that Muni's route plan has been modified in the near past so as to make transfers more necessary. Discussion developed that abandoning transfers, even if fares were partly reduced, would engender much public outcry given the current routing. More flexible fast passes, or shorter term passes, however, do appear to be a viable alternative to transfer use; the task force thus found such alternatives to be worth exploring. Again, however, the task force felt that the relative merit to be given to all such alternatives must await a proper ridership survey. (It should be noted that plans are currently being urged for a Muni ridership survey for purposes of the Congestion Management Plan, as mandated by Prop. 111. The task force suggests that transfer use questions be covered in this already-contemplated survey, such that little - if any - additional cost need be incurred to study transfer issues; the basic cost of any survey is estimated to be in the range of \$200,000 and take up to one year to complete.)





### Task Force Recommendations:

a) A ridership survey must be conducted, preferably in the context of the Congestion Management Plan, which includes transfer use questions.

b) Based on such a survey (as in recommendation a) above), a statistically proper study be taken of transfer misuse, so that the accurate and complete parameters of the problem are apparent.

c) In the interim, Muni should continue to post warning notices about transfer misuse so as to educate the public; other task force members (such as the District Attorney's Office) should consult with Muni regarding wording of the notices for maximum, legal impact.

d) In the interim, Muni should continue to focus upon all aspects of the transfer path, developing and enforcing policies to tighten transfer controls; the task force recommends adoption of a policy that all drivers personally and individually sign for all transfers by transfer number, and that such signed sheets be returned to PUC each day along with unused transfers (if within budgetary constraints). Additionally, the task force recommends re-keying all system lock boxes immediately to thwart use of old keys outstanding in the wrong hands.

e) Also in the interim, the Woods Owl service should be scrutinized as a suspect source of transfer loss; law enforcement efforts such as the street purchase program (with PUC tracing) should be continued, and any newly-discovered loss sources should be investigated in a Muni-SFPD cooperative manner.

f) An increase in SFPD Muni Transit Police Detail personnel (through new hiring, so as not to negatively impact police services in other areas) should be undertaken; this action would allow both increased undercover investigative efforts and increased uniformed presence as a deterrence. The task force recommends continued prosecution of provable transfer theft/sales, and urges the Supervisors to alert San Francisco criminal court judges to take these crimes seriously at time of sentencing.





g) Increased usage of fast passes and development of shorter or more flexible fast passes should be encouraged as alternatives to transfers; however, the task force does not recommend abandonment of the transfer system or modification of the fare structure at this time.

Respectfully submitted for the task force,

Jerry P. Coleman, Assistant District Attorney





Attachments to Task Force Report

- , SF Muni Bulletin 90-069 and 5 page policy memo "Muni Transfer Handling...";
- , English side of current Muni bus card;
- , Budget Analyst's multi-city transit survey grid.





# BULLETIN

TO OPERATING PERSONNEL

BULLETIN NUMBER

90-069

## POLICIES & PROCEDURES TO PREVENT ABUSE OF TRANSFERS

The proper use and security of MUNI transfers is of the utmost importance to ensure that MUNI obtains all the revenue to which it is entitled. Every transfer that falls into the wrong hands costs MUNI money and jeopardizes our ability to maintain adequate service levels.

All Transit Operators are reminded that the following policies & procedures are in effect and MUST be adhered to:

- 1) SELLING OF TRANSFERS IS PROHIBITED.
- 2) GIVING AWAY TRANSFERS IS PROHIBITED.
- 3) ONLY ONE TRANSFER IS TO BE ISSUED FOR EACH FARE PAID.
- 4) TIMES CUT ON TRANSFERS ARE TO BE NOT LESS THAN ONE HOUR & THIRTY MINUTES NOR MORE THAN TWO HOURS.
- 5) ALL TRANSFERS ARE TO BE COLLECTED FROM PASSENGERS. TRANSFERS WITH STUBS ATTACHED ARE TO BE RETURNED TO PASSENGERS ON REQUEST AFTER YOU HAVE REMOVED THE STUB.
- 6) ALL BOOKS OF TRANSFERS, EXCEPT THE BOOK ACTUALLY IN THE TRANSFER CUTTER, ARE TO BE SECURED IN THE LOCKED BOX ON YOUR VEHICLE.
- 7) IF YOU LEAVE YOUR VEHICLE FOR ANY REASON, TAKE THE BOOK IN THE CUTTER WITH YOU OR PUT IT INTO THE LOCKED BOX.

Your cooperation in adhering to these policies & procedures will help ensure that MUNI gets all the revenue to which it is entitled.

(E)

14 July 1990

In Effect Until Further Notice

*Johnny B. Stein*

Johnny B. Stein

Acting General Manager



# CAUTION

- Your transfer, pass or ticket is yours — do not attempt to sell it — this is a misdemeanor.
- Muni issues its own transfers, passes and tickets. If you are caught counterfeiting or selling these, you may spend a year in jail and pay a \$1,000 fine.
- Every person who knowingly possesses a receipt for fare with intent to defraud the Muni is also subject to imprisonment and fine.



San Francisco  
Municipal Railway





## TRANSPORTATION

### MUNI TRANSFER HANDLING, DISTRIBUTION, RETRIEVAL PROCEDURES

POLICY: It is the policy of the Municipal Railway to ensure that Muni Transfers are properly distributed and accounted for. To implement this policy the following procedures have been designed by this division.

The procedures include the following topics:

- I.     Recéipt of Transfers
- II.    Storage of Transfers
- III.   Preparation of Outfits
- IV.    Distribution of Outfits to Operators
- V.     Procurement of Unused Transfers/Division Staff Responsibilities
- VI.    Procurement of Unused Transfers/Operator Responsibilities

### PROCEDURES

- I.     Receipt of Transfers by Dispatcher from Senior Fare Collectors
  1.     Upon receipt of the transfers from the fare collector, the receiver or dispatcher verifies the quantity of the transfers delivered is the same as the quantity listed on the material tracking form and the quantity stated in the sealed case, box or package. If the seal is broken, such fact is stated in the Material Tracking Form.
  2.     If the quantity is different, the receiver or dispatcher informs the fare collector and indicates on the Material Tracking Form the quantity received. If the receiver upon opening the transfer receptacle finds a discrepancy between the stated quantity and the actual contents, a written note of the discrepancy is submitted through the Division Manager to PUC Finance for resolution.





3. A copy of the Material Tracking Form is furnished to the Division Manager for information and control.

## II. Storage of Transfers

1. Interim: Sunday and Monday transfers are stored in sealed cartons in the Division Dispatcher's Office prior to being processed into outfits. Processing of other days' transfers begins immediately after receipt.

Permanent: Sunday and Monday transfers are stored in locked cabinets prior to being processed into outfits.

2. Interim: The Division Manager assures only those with a need to prepare and distribute outfits are allowed to remove transfers from the office.

Permanent: Access to locked cabinets is limited to those only with a need to prepare and distribute outfits and the Division Manager.

3. Spare transfers are placed in a box. The box is placed in the office or cabinet where the new transfers are stored. The box has on it the color and code of transfers in it.
4. Transfers are not destroyed or discarded by anyone except by the authorized persons in the PUC transfer room.
5. At the end of the day the box of unused spare transfers is signed and sealed (taped) and marked with the name of the Division, date and number of books of transfers in it by the Dispatcher before it is given to the Senior Fare Collector.
6. Unused transfers belonging to a different or earlier date are placed in a separate box also signed and sealed with the Division name, date, number of books and reason why they are returned late.



### III. Preparation of Outfits

1. The Division Manager maintains a list of the number of transfers to be provided each run with spares to be retained for unforeseen events. A copy of this list is furnished the Division Manager and PUC Fare Collection Manager. No changes to that list are to be made by the Receiver or Dispatchers. Receivers and Dispatchers record the run number or Supervisor's shift assignment and number of books requested for all transfers issued from the allocation of spares.
2. Each outfit includes the full amount of transfers stipulated by the procedures. Careful attention must be given to ensure operators are not "shorted" as re-used transfer pads may have less than one hundred transfers.
3. After every General Sign-Up and any Barn Sign-Up where runs are significantly changed, the distribution list is updated as follows. As soon as operators have become, accustomed to their runs (1-3 weeks after the sign-up is in effect), the Receiver and Dispatcher will poll all operators for the transfer requirements of their runs as the operators pick up their outfits. The Division Manager then reviews this poll and revises the list to provide the number of books indicated by the poll.

### IV. Distribution of Outfits to Operators

1. The Receiver, or in his absence the Dispatcher, personally distributes the outfits to the individual operators. In no instance is the dispatching window unmonitored as operators pick up outfits. Operators must pick up their own outfits.
2. Any discrepancy or problem with distribution is documented in writing (i.e., operator indicates his/her outfit is missing).
3. Access to the Dispatcher/Receiver Office is limited to authorized staff. All transactions of operators and other staff with Receiver or Dispatcher are conducted through the Receiver's Window.





V. Procurement of Unused Transfers/Division Staff Responsibilities

1. Responsibility for removing all transfers from vehicles turning in is as follows. Other staff stationed at the turn-in point will assist upon request if those with responsibility must leave their posts for any reason.

<u>Day of Week</u>	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Position Responsible</u>
All Days	5:30 PM-3:00 AM	Revenue Collector
Weekdays	8:00 AM-9:30 AM	Division Clerk
All Other Times Operator deposits in locked box.		

2. Transfers obtained by responsible staff are placed into the locked transfer receptacle. Until such boxes are installed, cardboard boxes are not left unattended at any time and at the end of the shift,, the staff who obtained the unused transfers is responsible to deliver these to the Division Dispatcher, Receiver or Manager.
3. Under no circumstances are returned, unused transfers discarded.
4. At least once per quarter, vehicles are inspected by a Transit Supervisor after both AM and PM pull-ins to ensure compliance. A list of vehicles found to have unused transfers is reported to the Division Manager for conferencing of the staff concerned.

VI. Procurement of Unused Transfers/Operator Responsibilities

1. Operators are responsible for ensuring transfers are removed from vehicles when they have completed their route and vehicle is parked at the yard or elsewhere per previous bulletins #81-12 and dated 10/1/85 and notice dated 12/6/84.
2. Operators surrender possession of all unused transfers to the Pointsman, Revenue Collector or Transportation Supervisor when so requested. If no request is made, the transfers are removed from the vehicle and surrendered to such staff. If such staff is not available, transfers are placed into the locked transfer receptacle maintained at the gate of the parking yard. During the interim until lock boxes are installed, if staff are not available transfers must be returned to the Receiver, Dispatcher or Division Manager.





3. Under no circumstances are transfers:

- a) left unattended on a vehicle
- b) discarded in a trash bin or any other location
- c) taken by operator from Muni (taken home and then returned next day)

APPROVALS:

Transportation Division Manager:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Equipment Division Manager:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Revenue Department Manager:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

KG/st  
0464f

1. Report on the progress of the work

a) List of the work done

b) List of the work done

c) List of the work done

2. Report on the progress of the work

a) List of the work done

b) List of the work done

c) List of the work done

d) List of the work done

e) List of the work done

f) List of the work done

3. Report on the progress of the work



# Transfers

	<u>AC Translt</u>	<u>Atlanta</u>	<u>Baltimore</u>	<u>Boston</u>	<u>Chicago</u>	<u>Denver</u>	<u>D.C.</u>
Daily Ridership	215,000	290,000	300,300	455,000	1,500,000	173,000	450,000
Adult Fare - Peak	\$0.85	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$0.50	\$1.25	\$1.00	\$0.85
Adult Fare	\$0.75				\$1.00	\$0.50	
Transfer Cost	Free	Free	\$.10 (Free, also)	None for 20 yrs.	\$0.25	Free	Free
Transfer time limits	One hour	:40 to 1:40	:40	n/a	2:00 (Use twice)	:40	1:30 to 2:00
Adult Fast Pass Cost	\$30/\$54 by zone	\$36.00	\$38.50 - \$61.50	\$18 unrestricted	\$60/\$45 5&7 day	\$27.50	BI-weekly \$15
Transfers Dated	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes	Yes	Yes
Transfer Serial Numbers	Yes	Yes	Yes	n/a	Yes	No	Yes
Transfer Lock Box	No	No	No	n/a	No	No	No
Transfer Tracking	Random	No	Yes	n/a	Yes	No	Infrequently
Translt Police	Sheriff	165 Police Offs.	Yes	Yes	Police Dept.	One Person	Yes
Prosecution	Yes	Yes	Aggressive	n/a	Aggressive	No problems	Yes
Type fare box	Duncan	GFI (with card)	Cubic-Western		GFI	GFI	GFI
Transfer Controls	Used to have	No Problems	No Problem/	n/a	Tight Policy/	Liberalized	Video Camera
	Vapor Machine		Prosecute		Route of Origin Punched		Punch Control
	<u>Detroit</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>New Orleans</u>	<u>Portland</u>	<u>Seattle</u>	<u>San Francisco</u>	
Daily Ridership			200,000	167,800	200,000	750,194	
Adult Fare - Peak	\$1.00	\$1.15	\$1.00/ \$.80	\$0.90 & \$1.20	\$1.25	\$0.85	
Adult Fare					\$0.75		
Transfer Cost	\$0.10	Free	\$0.10	Free	Free	Free	
Transfer time limits			One Hour	One Hour	:45	1 Hour 45 Min.	
Adult Fast Pass Cost		Express Only	\$30.00	\$29 / \$39	\$26 and \$42	\$28.00	
Transfers Dated		Dated/Numbered	Yes	Yes/ Punched	Yes	Yes	
Transfer Serial Numbers			Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	
Transfer Lock Box			Vapor Machine	Pouch	No	yes	
Transfer Tracking			No	No	No	No	
Translt Police			9 Officers	10 fare/7 police		Yes	
Prosecution			Last Year	\$35 Citation		Yes	
Type fare box			Duncan	GFI		Keene	
Transfer Controls				Proof of Pymnt	Weak for Drivers	Yes	





0123303149